Document 1

## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA MIAMI DIVISION O 9 - 20423 AC-GOLD

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	)	MEALILEY
Petitioner,	)	
V.	)	FILED byD.C.
UBS AG,	)	FEB 1 9 2009
Respondent.	)	STEVEN M. LARIMORE CLERK U. S. DIST. CT. S. D. of FLA. – MIAMI

## PETITION TO ENFORCE JOHN DOE SUMMONS

The United States of America petitions this Court for an order enforcing the IRS "John Doe" summons served on the respondent, UBS. In support, the United States alleges as follows:

- 1. The Court has jurisdiction over this case under 26 U.S.C. §§ 7402 and 7604(a) and 28 U.S.C. §§ 1340 and 1345.
  - UBS is an international bank that is also found within this district. 2.
- 3. Daniel Reeves is a duly commissioned Internal Revenue Agent and Offshore Compliance Technical Advisor employed in the Small Business/Self Employed Division of the Internal Revenue Service. He is assigned to the Internal Revenue Service's Offshore Compliance Initiative.
- 4. Revenue Agent Reeves is conducting an investigation to determine the identity of US taxpayers who have violated the Internal Revenue Code by failing to report the existence of, and income earned in, undeclared Swiss accounts with UBS.

Page 2 of 6

- Attached to the DPA is a Statement of Facts that UBS admits are true. In the 6. Statement of Facts, UBS admitted the following, among other things:
  - "Beginning in 2000 and continuing until 2007, UBS . . . participated in a scheme to defraud the United States and . . . the IRS, by actively assisting or otherwise facilitating a number of U.S. individual taxpayers in establishing accounts at UBS in a manner designed to conceal the U.S. taxpayers' ownership or beneficial interest in such accounts." ¶ 4.A.
  - UBS "private bankers and managers would actively assist or otherwise b. facilitate certain undeclared U.S. taxpayers, who such private bankers and managers knew or should have known were evading United States taxes, by meeting with such clients in the United States and communicating with them via U.S. jurisdictional means in a regular and recurring basis with respect to the their UBS undeclared accounts. This enabled the U.S. clients to conceal from the IRS the active trading of securities held in such accounts and/or the making of payments and/or asset transfers to or from such accounts. Certain UBS executives and managers who knew of the conduct described in this paragraph continued to operate and expand the U.S. cross-border business because of its profitability." ¶ 4.C.
  - "In or about 2004, the UBS Wealth Management International business c. changed its compensation approach . . . Thereafter, the managers of the U.S. cross-border business implemented this new compensation structure in a way that provided incentives for U.S. cross-border private bankers to expand the size of the U.S. cross-border business. This encouraged those private bankers to have increased contacts in the United States with U.S.resident clients via travel to the United States and contact with U.S. clients via telephone, fax, mail and/or e-mail." ¶ 5.

Case 1:09-mc-20423-ASG

- d. "During the relevant period [2001 through 2007], Swiss-based UBS private bankers also traveled to the United States to meet with certain of their U.S. private clients, ... These [45 to 60 Swiss-based] private bankers traveled to the United States an average of two to three times per year, in trips that generally varied in duration from one to three weeks, and generally tried to meet with three to five clients per day. An internal UBS document estimated that U.S. cross-border business private bankers had made approximately 3,800 visits with clients in the United States during 2004. In addition, while in Switzerland, these private bankers would communicate via telephone, fax, mail and/or e-mail with certain of their private clients in the United States about their account relationships, including on occasion to take securities transaction orders in respect of offshore company accounts. Private bankers in the U.S. cross-border business typically traveled to the United States with encrypted laptop computers to maintain client confidentiality and received training on how to avoid detection by U.S. authorities while traveling to the United States." ¶ 6.
- "The U.S. cross border business generated approximately \$120 million e. \$140 million in annual revenues for UBS. . . ". ¶ 8. This conflicts with the estimate of two other sources that UBS's cross-border business generated \$200 million in annual profits. See, Reeves Decl., ¶ 43.
- 7. On July 1, 2008, this Court issued an order granting the United States leave to serve a "John Doe" summons on UBS AG. Case No. 08-21864-MC-LENARD/GARBER.
- 8. Internal Revenue Agent Arthur S. Brake is authorized to issue "John Doe" summonses pursuant to 26 U.S.C. § 7602, 26 C.F.R. § 301.7602-1, 26 C.F.R. § 301.7602-1T, and Internal Revenue Service Delegation Order No. 4 (as revised).
- 9. In furtherance of the investigation described in ¶ 4 above, on July 21, 2008 Revenue Agent Brake issued a "John Doe" summons to UBS. That summons directed UBS to appear before Revenue Agent Reeves or his designee on August 8, 2008 at 10:00 a.m., at the place identified in the summons, to give testimony and produce for examination certain books. papers, or other data as described in the summons.

- 10. Revenue Agent Brake served an attested copy of the summons on July 21, 2008 by delivering it in person to James Dow, Director & Head of Compliance for UBS.
- 11. UBS failed to appear on August 8, 2008. To date, UBS has failed to comply in full with the summons.
- 12. Except for the items specifically identified in Revenue Agent Reeves's Declaration filed with this Petition, the testimony and documents described in the summons are not already in the possession of the IRS.
- 13. All administrative steps required by the Internal Revenue Code for the issuance of the summons have been followed.
- 14. The testimony, books, records, papers, and/or other data sought by the summons may be relevant to the IRS's investigation.
- 15. The identities of the "John Does" are unknown. Accordingly, the IRS does not know whether there is any "Justice Department referral," as that term is defined by 26 U.S.C. § 7602(d)(2), in effect with respect to any unknown "John Doe" for the years under investigation.
- 16. The Declarations of Daniel Reeves and Barry B. Shott filed with this Petition establish the four elements necessary to prove a *prima facie* case to enforce the summons:
  - a. The investigation will be conducted pursuant to a legitimate purpose.
  - b. The information sought may be relevant to that purpose.
  - c. The information sought is not already in the possession of the IRS.
  - d. All administrative steps required by the Internal Revenue Code have been followed.

United States v. Powell, 379 U.S. 48, 57-58 (1964). Accordingly, the burden now shifts to the respondent to show why the summons should not be enforced. United States v. Medlin, 986 F.2d 463, 466 (11th Cir. 1993).

WHEREFORE, the United States respectfully prays that the Court:

- A. Enter an order directing the respondent to show cause, if any it has, why it should not comply with summons in all respects; and,
- B. Enter an order directing the respondent to comply in full with the summons, by ordering the respondent to appear, testify and produce documents demanded in the summons, before Revenue Agent Daniel Reeves, or such other officer or employee of the IRS that it may designate, within 10 days of entry of the Order, or at such later time and place as may be set by Revenue Agent Reeves or such other officer or employee of the IRS.

R. ALEXANDER ACOSTA

United States Attorney

By:

STUART D\GIBSON

Senior Litigation Counsel, Tax Division

U.S. Department of Justice

P.O. Box 403

Washington, D.C. 20044

Telephone: (202) 307-6586 Facsimile: (202) 307-2504 Stuart.D.Gibson@usdoj.gov

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provide by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiatin

the civil docket sheet. (SEE IN	ISTRUCTIONS ON THE REVERSE OF TH	E FORM.) NOT	ICE: Attorneys MUS	ST Indicate All Re-filed Ca	ises Below.
I. (a) PLAINTIFFS			DEFENDANTS		
United States of America		UBS AG			
(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)			County of Residence of First Listed Defendant Dade (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY)		
(c) Attorney's (Firm Name, Ad	dress, and Telephone Number)		NOTE: IN LAND	CONDEMNATION CASES, USE	THE LOCATION OF THE TRACT
Stuart D. Gibson, U.S. Department of Justice Tax Division, P.O. Box 403 Washington, DC 20044 (202) 307-6586			Attorneys (If Known)	FILED by	p.c.
(d) Check County Where Action	on Arose: 🗸 MIAMI- DADE 🏻 🗇 MONR	OE 🗇 BROWARD	☐ PALM BEACH ☐ MA	FFR RTIN O ST. UCKETO INDIA	9 2009 NRIVER DOKE CHOBEE LARIMOREHIGI LANDS
II. BASIS OF JURISD	ICTION (Place an "X" in One Box O	nly) III. C	ITIZENSHIP OF P		DIST CT. One Box for Plaintif
√⊃ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	☐ 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party)	Citiz	(For Diversity Cases Only) en of This State	TF DEF  I	= =
2 U.S. Government Defendant	☐ 4 Diversity	1	en of Another State	2	•
Dade Ogn	(Indicate Citizenship of Parties in	old Meiz	of Subjection of a	3 🗖 3 Foreign Nation	□ 6 □ 6
IV. NATURE OF SUIT	(**************************************				
☐ 110 Insurance ☐ 120 Marine ☐ 130 Miller Act ☐ 140 Negotiable Instrument ☐ 150 Recovery of Overpayment     & Enforcement of Judgment ☐ 151 Medicare Act ☐ 152 Recovery of Defaulted     Student Loans     (Excl. Veterans) ☐ 153 Recovery of Overpayment     of Veteran's Benefits ☐ 160 Stockholders' Suits ☐ 190 Other Contract ☐ 195 Contract Product Liability ☐ 196 Franchise ☐ REAL PROPERTY ☐ 210 Land Condemnation ☐ 220 Forcelosure ☐ 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment ☐ 240 Torts to Land ☐ 245 Tort Product Liability ☐ 290 All Other Real Property	310 Airplane	ONAL INJURY ersonal Injury - ed. Malpractice ersonal Injury - ers	in Agriculture  ito Agriculture  ito Agriculture  ito Agriculture  ito Agriculture  ito Agriculture  of Property 21 USC 881  ito R.R. & Truck  ito Airline Regs.  ito Occupational  Safety/Health  ito Other  LABOR  Ito Fair Labor Standards  Act  Ito Fair Labor Standards  Act  Ito Fair Labor/Mgmt. Relations  ito Labor/Mgmt. Reporting  & Disclosure Act  Ito Cabor/Mgmt. Reporting  & Disclosure Act  Ito Other Labor Litigation  Ito Call Call Call Call Call Call  Ito Call Call Call Call Call  Ito Call Call Call  Ito Call Call Call  Ito Call Call Call  Ito Call Call  Ito Call Call  Ito Call Call Call  Ito Call  Ito Call Call  Ito Ca	or Defendant)	OTHER STATUTES  400 State Reapportionment 410 Antitrust 430 Banks and Banking 450 Commerce 460 Deportation 470 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations 480 Consumer Credit 490 Cable/Sat TV 810 Selective Service 850 Securities/Commodities/ Exchange 875 Customer Challenge 12 USC 3410 890 Other Statutory Actions 891 Agricultural Acts 892 Economic Stabilization Act 893 Environmental Matters 894 Energy Allocation Act 895 Freedom of Information Act 900 Appeal of Fee Determination Under Equal Access to Justice
💋 l Original 🔲 2 Re	n "X" in One Box Only) emoved from			Terred from	Appeal to District ct 7 Judge from Magistrate Judgment
VI. RELATED/RE-FII CASE(S).	(See instructions second page):  a) Re-file  JUDGE L	ed Case □ YES 🚜 enard	NO b) Relat	ed Cases <b>Ø</b> YES <b>I</b> NO DOCKET NUMBER 08-	
VII. CAUSE OF ACTI	LENGTH OF TRIAL via	etition to Enforce	e "John Doe" Summo	ons	lictional statutes unless
VIII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:	CHECK IF THIS IS A CLAS UNDER F.R.C.P. 23	S ACTION D	EMAND \$	CHECK YES only i JURY DEMAND:	f demanded in complaint:  ☐ Yes  ☐ No
ABOVE INFORMATION IS THE BEST OF MY KNOWL		The of Attaches	of Record	2/DATE	2009
			FOR OF	FICE USE ONLY RECEIPT #	IFP

## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA

## -20423 AC-GOLD

UNITED STATE	S OF AMERICA,	)	McALILEY			
	Petitioner,	)				
v.		)				
UBS AG,		)				
	Respondent.	)				
ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE						
Upon the	petition of the United St	ates, and the Declaratio	ns of Barry B. Shott and Danie			

el Reeves, and the summons attached to the Reeves Declaration, it is hereby

ORDERED that the respondent, UBS AG, appear before the United States District Court for the Southern District of Florida, before the Honorable \_\_\_\_\_, in that Judge's courtroom in the United States Courthouse at 400 North Miami Avenue in Miami, FL 33128 on the \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2009, at \_\_\_\_ .m., to show cause why UBS AG should not be compelled to comply in full with the Internal Revenue Service summons served on it on July 21, 2008. It is further

ORDERED that a copy of this Order, together with the Petition and Declarations, be personally served on UBS AG by an official of the Internal Revenue Service within eleven (11) days of the date of this Order. It is further

ORDERED that within eleven (11) days of service of copies of this Order and the Petition and the Declarations upon it, the respondent shall file and serve written responses to the Petition supported by appropriate affidavit(s), as well as any motions it desires to make. It is further

ORDERED that all motions and issues raised by respondent will be considered upon the return date of this Order, that only those issues raised by motion or brought into controversy by the responsive pleadings and supported by affidavit(s) will be considered at the return of this Order, and that any allegations in the Petition not contested by affidavit(s) will be considered as admitted for the purpose of this enforcement proceeding. Affidavits in opposition to the Petition or in support of any motion shall be made on personal knowledge, shall set forth such facts as would be admissible in evidence, and shall show affirmatively that the affiant is competent to testify to the matters stated therein. Any affidavit failing to comply with this standard shall not be considered by this Court. It is further

ORDERED that if respondent files an objection to the entry of an order granting the relief sought in the Petition filed in this case, the petitioner shall have eleven (11) days from the date the respondent files its opposition in which to file a Reply which may be supported by additional affidavit(s), which shall be subject to the same requirements as the affidavit(s) which the respondent may offer. It is further

ORDERED that if respondent has no objection to entry of an order directing compliance with the summons issued to it, it will not be required to respond or appear as ordered above if the Clerk of the Court receives written notification thereof (with copies to counsel for petitioner) at least five (5) business days prior to the hearing scheduled above.

Entered this	day of	, 2009.		
		UNITED S	STATES DISTRICT.	JUDGE

COPY TO:

STUART D. GIBSON
Department of Justice
Tax Division
P.O. Box 403
Ben Franklin Station
Washington, D.C. 20044
Stuart.D.Gibson@usdoj.gov

COUNSEL FOR PETITIONER